

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,416		09/30/2003	Jui -Mei Hsu	CMOP0024USA	2415
27765	7590	10/27/2005		EXAM	INER
		INTELLECTUAL	NGUYEN, THANH NHAN P		
P.O. BOX 59 MERRIFIEI		22116		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•			2871	2415 IER NH NHAN P
				DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Evenines Initiated Intensions Comm		10/605,416	HSU, JUI -MEI
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summ	nary	Examiner	Art Unit
		(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	2871
All Participants:		Status of Application: _	
(1) (Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen. TN		(3) Scott Margo.	
(2) Tarifur Chowdhury.		(4)	
Date of Interview: 26 October 2005		Time: <u>11 a.m.</u>	•
	☐ Applicar 〗No	nt's representative)	
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: U.S.C 103(a)			
Claims discussed: 20 & 24			
Prior art documents discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,819,375	·	,	
Part II.		•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING T See Continuation Sheet	HE GENER	AL NATURE OF WHAT W	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a directly resulted in the allowance of the appli of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a did not result in resolution of all issues. A brid 	cation. The separate re	examiner will provide a wrecord of the substance of the	itten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview
	or Juliiniary	by the examiner appears in	TT GIT II GDOVO.
TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY			
PRIMARY EXAMINER			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/	Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed; Discussed the relative position of the upper substrate, the lower substrate, the color filter, and the reflection layer as recited in claims 20 & 24.

Applicant's representative presented arguments whether the cited reference could be used for claims 20 & 24 rejection. Even though Examiner didn't totally agree with Applicant's representative, Applicant's representative was notified that further consideration would be given to the reference as well on the claim to define patentability.